DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 329 HE 033 084

AUTHOR	Castle, Sharon; Arends, Richard I.
TITLE	Vacancies and Applicant Pools: Results of the AACTE Faculty Supply and Demand Survey.
PUB DATE	2000-04-00
NOTE	27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Faculty; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Job Applicants; *Minority Group Teachers; Personnel Selection; Teacher Education; Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Supply and Demand; Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS	*American Association of Colleges for Teacher Educ

ABSTRACT

This study investigated faculty vacancy and applicant pools among American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) member institutions. A survey instrument sent to member institutions requested information regarding openings in each teacher education program area for the 1997-98 and 1998-99 academic years and projected openings for the 1999-00 academic year. Participants also reported the number of applicants for each opening, the number of searches that failed, and the percentage of minority faculty hired. Of the 408 usable surveys returned, 368 reported openings. Total openings increased by 34 percent, suggesting that demand is increasing. However, supply is not keeping up the pace, as evidenced by the fact that the number of applicants per opening decreased by 19 percent. Program areas with small applicant pools and high failed searches included early childhood education, elementary education, library media, mathematics education, reading, special education, business education, and vocational education. About 21 percent of new hires were minorities. One perceived reason for low numbers of applicants may be that other educational institutions are drawing individuals away from higher education; a second may be that low K-12 salaries are hampering colleges from recruiting qualified applicants. (Contains 11 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 443 329

Vacancies and Applicant Pools:

Results of the AACTE Faculty Supply and Demand Survey

Sharon Castle
George Mason University

Richard I. Arends
Central Connecticut State University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY:

C. CASTLE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented as part of the Symposium, "Replenishing the Ranks: Managing the Tension Between Faculty Quality and Quantity" at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April, 2000.

H033e84

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For the past two decades, the research and commentary on faculty supply and demand have emphasized the oversupply of Ph.D.s and a restricted job market. As recently as the mid 1990s, articles were reporting a limited job market, one where campuses were raising requirements and where few opportunities existed for new faculty (Smith, 1996). Anecdotal evidence suggested that campuses were receiving literally hundreds of applications for every position posted (Barkume,1997). Simply put, the general belief was that there were too many Ph.D.s being granted for the realties of the marketplace (Atwell, 1996; Barkume, 1997; Smith & Pierce, 1995).

Much of the research on faculty supply and demand, however, focused on the sciences and the humanities. It did not speak directly to the field of education. Often, authors would caution that in reality the academic labor market was not a single market, but many (Schuster, 1995). Milan (19980) pointed out that many supply and demand studies such as Massy and Goldman (1995) and Bowen and Sosa (1989) were flawed because they did not treat faculty supply and demand by discipline. What this means to the field of education is unclear. However, one study which focused specifically on special education (Smith and Pierce, 1995) found that the demand for new Ph.D.s was in excess of supply. Smith and Pierce cited two reasons for this situation: 1) insufficient production rates and 2) many career options for special educators outside of higher education.

By the late 1990s, some commentary and research began speculating that the nature of the academic job market might be changing. Barkume (1997) argued that although anecdotal evidence continued to suggest a surplus of Ph.D.s, labor market statistics were more optimistic. Magner (1997; 1999), writing in The Chronicle, speculated that the job market for Ph.D.s was showing signs of improvement brought on mainly by the spate of retirements in the late 1990s and a healthy economy. She was quick to point out, however, that new Ph.D.s were not automatically finding jobs because a huge backlog of Ph.D.s existed who were currently doing part-time teaching.

Problem

The current study grew out of concerns expressed by the AACTE Research and Information Committee. Members reported situations where their institutions experienced very small applicant pools when conducting national searches for vacant faculty positions. This led the committee to commission the current study. Its purpose was to find answers to four questions about vacancies and the applicant pools from AACTE member institutions:

1. How many vacancies existed over a two year period in specific program areas?
2. How many individuals applied for each position?
3. How many searches failed to find a qualified applicant?
4. What percentage of total faculty hired represented minorities?

In addition, the study collected information as to the reasons for failed searches. Specifically, respondents were asked:

1. To what extent has your institution experienced a decline in applicants over the past 2 or 3 years?
2. What are your perceptions of the reasons for shortages or failed searches?

Methods

A two-page survey instrument was designed to collect information for each of the research questions (see Appendix A). Respondents were asked to report the number of openings for each program area in their SCDE for the 1997-98 and 1998-99 academic years respectively and to report anticipated openings for 1999-2000. They were also asked to report the number of applicants their institution received for each opening as well as the number of searches that failed. Program areas listed on the

survey instrument included 19 program areas defined by NCATE. Respondents could also report openings in an "Other" category.

The survey was attached as an addendum to the Annual AACTE/NCATE Joint Data Collection Survey and mailed to each of the 752 AACTE member institutions with a designated date of return of October 1, 1999 . Four hundred sixteen surveys were returned. Eight surveys were discarded because of inconsistent data, leaving 408 usable surveys. The response rate was 54.3% which, according to AACTE, is a normal response rate for a survey attached to the JDCS.

Results

Respondents

Of the 408 useable surveys, 368 reported openings and 40 reported no openings. Table 1 shows the responding institutions by size: small [38.1%], medium [43.2%] and large [18.7%]; sponsor: public [51%] and private [49%]; and type: liberal arts [29.2%], regional comprehnsive[48%] and research [22.8%].

Openings, Applicants, Hires and Failed Searches

All institutions. Table 2 indicates the results for openings, applicants, hires and failed searches at the responding institutions. The number of openings totaled 1,268 for 1997-98 and 1,700 for 1998-99, an increase of 34% between 1997-98 and 1998-99. The number of opening per institution was 3.1 for 1997-98 and 4.2 for 1998-99. The total number of applicants for these openings totaled 19,895 for 1997-98 and 21,585 for 1998-99, an increase of 8%. The number of applicants per opening was 15.7 in 1997-98 and 12.7 in 1998-99, a decrease of 19%. The number of hires equaled 965 for 1997-98 and 1,246 for 1998-99 indicating that 76% and 73% of the openings were filled during the two years, respectively. Failed searches numbered 303 for 1997-98 and 454 for 1998-99 indicating that 24% and 27% of the searches resulted in failures during the two years, respectively.

Institutions by size, sponsor and type. Table 3 shows the mean number of openings and applicants and the percentage of failed searches by the size, sponsor and type of the institutions that reported openings. Large institutions reported more openings (7.2) than medium (3.9) or small institutions (2.1); public institutions (5.2) reported considerably more openings than private ones (2.6); and research institutions reported more openings (5.8) than regional (4.2) or liberal arts institutions (2.1). The difference in openings between public and private institutions can be attributed to the fact that, as a whole, private institutions tend to be smaller.

Large institutions reported more applicants (24.4) than medium (19.8) or small ones (17.5); public (20.6) and private (19.8) reported about the same number of applicants; and research universities reported more applicants (25.2) than regional (16.8) or liberal arts institutions (18.4).

Percentage of failed searches was fairly consistent regardless of size, sponsor or type of institution with large institutions having somewhat fewer failed searches (23.0).

Program areas. Results by program areas are shown in Table 4. The total number of openings combined for the 2 years totaled 2,968. The average number of applicants per opening across program areas was 14.2. The percentage of failed searches was 25%. For each program area listed on the survey and the "other" areas added by respondents, number of openings, average number of applicants per opening and percent of failed searches are indicated for the 2-year period.

The average number of applicants across program areas was 14.2. Program areas below the average are marked with an asterisk indicating smaller than average applicant pools. These programs include: Library Media (6.2), Technology Education (8.2), Early Childhood (8.8), Special Education (10.1), Elementary Education (10.8), Physical Education (11.5), Health (11.7), Mathematics (12.0) and Reading (12.4). "Other" areas with low numbers of applicants include: Business(7.8), Agriculture (8.8), Vocational Education (11.2) and Fine Arts (11.8).

The average percentage of failed searches across program areas was 25%. Program areas with failed searches above the average are marked with 2 asterisks. These programs include: Reading (35.8), Early Childhood Education (35.3), Library Media (33.1), Mathematics (32.6), Bilingual Education (32.5), Science (32.5), Social Studies (31.9), Elementary Education (28.7), Educational Leadership/Administration (28.5) and Special Education (26.7). "Other" program areas with above average percentages of failed searches include: Vocational Education (75), Business (33.4) and Field Experiences (29.8).

Program areas with lower than average applicant pools and higher than average failed searches, which may indicate areas of particular need, include: Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Library Media, Mathematics, Reading and Special Education. "Other" areas include: Business Education and Vocational Education.

Hiring demographics. Numbers and percentages of minority and non-minority hires are shown in Table 5. Of all the faculty positions filled in 1997-98 and 1998-99, 21.1% were filled by minorities and 78.9% were filled by non-minorities. African-Americans constituted the largest group of minority hires (12% and 11.5 % in respective years). Hispanics showed a slight increase the second year (from 3.6% to 4.3%).

Table 6 shows hiring demographics by size, sponsor and type of institution. Medium-sized institutions reported hiring somewhat more minorities (22.5%) than large institutions (20.9%) and considerably more than small institutions (16.6%). Private institutions reported hiring somewhat more minorities (22%) than did public institutions (20.7%). Research institutions hired more minorities (23%) than regional (20%) or liberal arts institutions (20.5%). Looking at the results by ethnic groups shows that medium-sized institutions hired the highest percentages of Native Americans (1.1%) and African Americans (13.05%), while large institutions hired the highest percentage of Asians (4.75%) and Hispanics (5.05%). Public institutions hired higher percentages of

Native Americans (1.15%) and Hispanics (4.55%), while private institutions hired higher percentages of Asians (4.7%) and African Americans (22.5). Liberal arts institutions hired the highest percentage of African Americans (15.1%), regional institutions the highest percentage of Native Americans (1.15%), and research institutions hired the highest percentage of Asians (4.9%) and Hispanics (4.7%).

Reasons for Shortages

Table 7 shows respondents' perceptions of the extent to which the applicant pool has decreased over the last 2-3 years. Nearly 60% reported some (46.4%) or a great (13.1%) decrease whereas 38% reported a small (19.4%) or no (21%) decrease.

Perceived reasons for shortages are listed in Table 8. Respondents agreed more than disagreed with all six reasons. The highest percentages of agreement were shown for other educational institutions attracting the same candidates (73%) and higher salaries in K-12 schools (72%). The lowest percentage of agreement occurred for not enough doctorates (58%).

Table 9 shows the results of the extent of decline and reasons for shortages by institutional size, sponsor and type. For extent of decline, large and private institutions showed the highest level of agreement (69% and 62% respectively). However, an independent t-test showed no significant statistical differences.

In terms of reasons for shortages, large , public and liberal arts institutions showed the highest level of agreement for other educational institutions attract candidates from the same pool (83%, 77% and 74% respectively). Large and private institutions agreed that higher education salaries are not competitive with K-12 positions (87% and 73% respectively). Medium, public and research institutions agreed most strongly that the caliber of applicants did not meet their expectations (63%, 63% and 68% respectively). Public institutions agreed most strongly that the economy is good so people are staying where they are (69%). Private and regional institutions agreed that their salaries are not competitive with other SCDEs (61% for each). Finally, large and public institutions

showed the highest level of agreement that too few doctorates are being produced 67% and 60%). A 1-way ANOVA revealed only one significant difference: public institutions were significantly more likely to say that people staying where they are is a reason for shortages ($t = -2.44$, $p = .015$).

Conclusions

In the current study, demand is operationalized by number of openings and failed searches, while supply is operationalized by number of applicants and number of hires. Demand seems to be increasing in that total openings rose 34%. However, supply is not keeping up the pace in that the number of applicants per opening decreased by 19%. These findings are consistent with respondents' perceptions that the number of applicants has declined. Thus, openings have increased more than applicants resulting in failed searches for 25% of the openings. The demand seems greater than the supply. These findings stand in contrast to reports of faculty surpluses from the mid-90's (Atwell, 1996; Barkhume, 1997; Smith, 1996). However, they support Magner's (1997; 1999) speculations that the job market for Ph.D.s is improving.

Because of criticisms that the supply and demand literature did not treat education (Schuster, 1995) or disciplines (Milan, 1998) separately, the current study looked at supply and demand by program areas. Supply and demand are segmented within program areas by the average size of the applicant pools and the percentage of failed searches. Program areas with both small applicant pools and high failed searches include Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Library Media, Mathematics Education, Reading, Special Education, Business Education, and Vocational Education. This supports the findings of Smith and Pierce (1995) in special education.

Responding institutions reported that 21% of their new hires were minorities. With the exception of small institutions at 16.6%, all other categories showed minority hires ranging from 20% to 23%. According to The Chronicle (1999), the percentage of

full-time minority faculty in 1995 was about 15%. The current data suggest increases in minority hires over the last several years.

Perceived reasons for the low number of applicants had to do with other educational institutions drawing individuals away from higher education. First is the perception that research and development, professional and governmental institutions are drawing from the same applicant pool. Second is the perception that K-12 salaries are hampering SCDEs from recruiting qualified applicants. This supports Smith and Pierce's (1995) conclusion that there are many career options for educators outside of higher education. In contrast to Smith and Pierce, however, is the perception that insufficient production of new Ph.D.s is the least critical reason for shortages. The lack of any meaningful differences in responses indicates that the institutions, regardless of size, sponsor or type, perceive a decline in applicants and attribute that decline to similar reasons. However, perceived reasons may or may not accurately portray the real underlying difficulties.

While the results indicate that demand is greater than supply, that this is more true in some program areas than others, and that the percentage of minority hires is increasing, questions remain that cannot be answered by the current survey. It shows vacancies and applicants pools over a 2-year period, but what will the demand be over the next five years? What is the level of quality in the applicant pool? How many hires are successful over time (i.e., receive tenure)? How many applicants are willing to move and how many have limited mobility; to what extent does this give certain regions or metropolitan areas a hiring advantage? What are the demographics of the hires in terms of rank and changes in career paths? What makes some applicants persist in higher education searches while others take positions in other education institutions or the private sector? What are the implications of increasing faculty shortages at the same time as increasing teacher shortages? Might there be reasons for faculty shortages in addition to those listed on the survey? Finally, what makes higher education less attractive than other education venues?

The only factor that can be identified from the current survey is K-12 salaries. It would be interesting to investigate other potential reasons such as working conditions in higher education (both perceived and real) and the low value placed on practitioner and field-based experience in the candidate selection process. Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education may need to assess both their competing forces and their own cultures.

References

Atwell, R. H. (1996). Doctoral education must match the nation's need and the realities of the marketplace. Chronicle of Higher Education, 43, B4-5.

Barkume, M. (1997). The job market for Ph.D.s: Two views. Occupational Outlook Quarterly, 40, 2-15.

Bowen, W. G. & Sosa, J. A. (1989). Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (1999). Almanac issue. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 46 (1).

Magner, D. K. (1997). Job market for Ph.D.s shows first signs of improvement, but uncertainty remains. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 43, A8-9.

Magner, D. K. (1999). For job hunters in academe, 1999 offers signs of an upturn. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 45, A14-16.

Massy, W. F. & Goldman, C. A. (1995). The Production and Utilization of Science and Engineering Doctorates in the United States. Stanford, CA: Stanford Institute for Higher Education Research.

Milan, J. (1998). The glut of Ph.D.s: Complex models for the faculty workforce. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Minneapolis.

Schuster, J. H. (1995). Wither the faculty? The changing academic labor market. Educational Record, 76, 28-33.

Smith, D. D. & Pierce, T. B. (1995). The state of special education leadership training and college and university faculty: What we know and what we don't. Teacher Education and Special Education, 18, 156-165.

Smith, D. G. (1996). Achieving faculty diversity: Debunking the myths. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Table 1

Respondents by Type, Size and Sponsor of Institution

Institution	Number	Percent
Total	408	100.0
Size		
Small	156	38.1
Medium	176	43.2
Large	76	18.7
Sponsor		
Public	208	51.0
Private	200	49.0
Type		
Liberal Arts	119	29.2
Regional	196	48.0
Research	93	22.8

Note. Size is determined by AACTE productivity figures. Small = total productivity of 1-100; Medium = 101-500; Large = 501 or more.

Table 2

Openings, Applicants, Hires and Failed Searches for All Institutions Reporting Openings

	1997-98	1998-99	Total/X/%	Change
Openings				
Number	1,268	1,700	2,968	+34%
Per Institution	3.1	4.2	4.0	
Applicants				
Number	19,895	21,585	41,480	+8%
Per Opening	15.7	12.7	14.2	-19%
Hires				
Number	965	1,246	2,211	
As % of Openings	76%	73%	75%	
Failed Searches				
Number	303	454	757	
As % of Openings	24%	27%	25%	

Note. Of the 408 respondents, 368 reported openings and 40 reported no openings.

Note. Anticipated Openings for 1999-2000 totaled 1335.

Table 3

Openings, Applicants and Failed Searches by Institutional Size, Sponsor and Type

Institutional Characteristics	Mean Openings per Institution	Mean Applicants per Opening	% of Failed Searches
Total	4.0	14.2	25
Size			
Small	2.1	11.4	26.3
Medium	3.9	14.2	27.8
Large	7.2	15.8	23.0
Sponsor			
Public	5.2	14.8	26.5
Private	2.6	13.1	24.7
Type			
Liberal Arts	2.1	11.3	25.6
Regional	4.2	12.2	26.4
Research	5.8	18.7	25.4

Note. Averaged for 1997-98 and 1998-99.

Note. Based on number of institutions with openings.

Table 4

Openings, Applicants and Failed Searches by Program Areas

Program Areas (NCATE Categories)	Number of Openings	Average # of Applicants	% of Failed Searches
Total	2968	14.2	25.0
Early Childhood	191	8.8*	35.3**
Ed Lead/Admin	303	16.2	28.5**
Ed Technology	113	16.0	23.8
Ed Found/Policy	159	20.2	11.7
Elementary Ed	394	10.8*	28.7**
Eng/Language Arts	77	34.1	16.9
Health Ed	48	11.7*	20.3
Library Media	31	6.2*	33.1**
Mathematics Ed	128	12.0*	32.6**
Middle School Ed	41	17.0	19.5
Physical Ed	170	11.5*	18.5
Reading Ed	183	12.4*	35.8**
School Counseling	172	17.5	23.1
School Psychology	63	18.4	17.0
Science Ed	91	15.2	32.5**
Social Studies Ed	87	16.4	31.9**
Special Ed	362	10.1*	26.7**
TESOL/Bilingual Ed	54	20.5	32.5**

Table 4 (cont'd)

Openings, Applicants and Failed Searches by Program Areas

Program Areas (NCATE Categories)	Total Openings	Average # of Applicants	% of Failed Searches
Technology Ed	63	8.2*	18.8
OTHER:			
Agriculture	5	8.8*	25.0
Business Ed	14	7.8*	33.4**
Curr & Instruction	13	25.2	19.7
Ed Psych	30	19.8	25.0
Field Experiences	13	18.5	29.8**
Fine Arts	33	11.8*	23.9
Higher Ed	11	22.4	0
Multicultural Ed	10	33.8	20.0
Research/Meas/Eval	22	24.4	14.8
Secondary Ed	52	16.2	19.3
Teacher-in-Residence	3	10.0*	0
Vocational Ed	4	11.2*	75.0**
Miscellaneous	21	15.2	9.3

Note. Averaged for 1997-98 and 1998-99.

Note. * = below average number of applicants, ** = above average percentage of failed searches.

Table 5

Numbers and Percentages of Minority and Non-minority Hires

Race/Ethnic Origin	Hires 1997-98	Hires 1998-99	% of Hires 1997-98	% of Hires 1998-99
Minorities				
Native/Alaskan American	10	13	1.0	1.1
Asian/Pacific	43	53	4.4	4.3
African American	117	142	12.0	11.5
Hispanic	35	53	3.6	4.3
Total	205	261	21.1	21.1
Non-minorities				
White	767	977	78.9	78.9
Total	972	1238	100.0	100.0

Table 6

Percentage of Minority and Non-Minority Hires by Institutional Size, Sponsor and Type

	Native American	Asian	African American	Hispanic	Minority Total	Non-Minority Total
All Institutions	1.05	4.35	11.75	3.95	21.1	78.9
Size						
Small	0.7	3.0	11.0	1.3	16.6	83.4
Medium	1.1	4.55	13.05	3.75	22.5	77.5
Large	1.0	4.75	10.2	5.05	20.9	79.1
Sponsor						
Public	1.15	4.25	10.85	4.55	20.7	79.3
Private	0.8	4.7	22.05	2.5	22.0	78.0
Type						
Liberal Arts	1.05	2.65	15.1	1.9	20.5	79.5
Regional	1.15	4.4	10.65	3.8	20.0	80.0
Research	0.85	4.9	12.65	4.7	23.0	77.0

Note. Averages for 1997-98 and 1998-99.

Table 7

Means and Frequency Distributions for Extent of Decline in Applicants

Question	fi	%	N	X	Percent Marking Great/Some
To what extent has your institution experienced a decline in the number of applicants for positions vacant the past 2-3 years?			366	2.52	60
Great	48	13			
Some	170	46			
Small	71	19			
None	77	21			

Note. The heading for this section of the survey reads, "This part of the survey asks you to indicate the reasons that may have resulted in failed searches." Thus, some respondents with no failed searches did not answer this question resulting in 366 responses.

Table 8

Means and Frequency Distributions for Reasons for Shortages

Reason	fi	%	N	X	% of Agreement
Other institutions (R & D, professional, government) are attracting candidates from the same pool.			287	2.89	73
Strongly Agree	49	17			
Agree	159	55			
Disagree	76	27			
Strongly Disagree	3	1			
Our salaries will not allow us to recruit experienced teachers and administrators from K-12 schools.			296	3.02	72
Strongly Agree	96	32			
Agree	117	40			
Disagree	75	25			
Strongly Disagree	8	3			
The caliber of applicants did not meet our expectations.			294	2.67	62
Strongly Agree	31	11			
Agree	150	51			
Disagree	99	34			
Strongly Disagree	14	5			
The economy is good and people are staying where they are.			281	2.66	61
Strongly Agree	19	7			
Agree	150	53			
Disagree	109	39			
Strongly Disagree	3	1			
Salaries in our SCDE are not competitive with other SCDEs.			299	2.66	59
Strongly Agree	43	14			
Agree	134	45			
Disagree	98	33			
Strongly Disagree	24	8			

Table 8 (cont'd)

Means and Frequency Distributions for Reasons for Shortages

Reason	fi	%	N	X	% of Agreement
There are not enough individuals receiving doctorates in our vacancy area.			292	2.67	58
Strongly Agree	35	9			
Agree	135	33			
Disagree	113	28			
Strongly Disagree	9	2			

Note. Respondents were instructed to skip this section if they answered "Small" or "None" to question on extent of decline. Thus, number of responses varies.

Table 9

Extent of Decline in Applicants and Reasons for Shortages by Institutional Size, Sponsor and Type

	Decline		Other Insts		K-12		Caliber		Staying Put		Salaries		Too Few Drs	
	X	%	X	%	X	%	X	%	X	%	X	%	X	%
All Institutions	2.5	60	2.9	73	3.0	72	2.7	62	2.7	61	2.7	59	2.7	58
Size														
Small	2.5	57	2.8	68	3.0	73	2.7	59	2.6	50	2.6	59	2.7	56
Medium	2.5	57	2.9	73	3.0	68	2.7	63	2.7	66	2.7	60	2.6	56
Large	2.7	69	3.1	83	3.1	78	2.6	62	2.7	65	2.6	58	2.8	67
Sponsor														
Public	2.6	62	2.9	77	3.0	71	2.6	63	2.7	69	2.6	58	2.7	60
Private	2.5	57	2.9	68	3.0	73	2.7	61	2.6	51	2.7	61	2.7	56
Type														
Liberal Arts	2.5	57	3.0	74	3.0	71	2.7	59	2.7	59	2.6	59	2.6	49
Regional	2.6	61	2.8	72	3.0	72	2.7	60	2.7	61	2.7	61	2.7	62
Research	2.5	61	2.9	72	3.0	72	2.7	68	2.6	60	2.6	57	2.7	62

Note. % = percentage of agreement (some + great, agree + strongly agree)

Appendix A

Institution:_____State____INSTID_____1999 JDCS Addendum

School, Colleges, and Departments of Education
Faculty Supply and Demand Survey

I. Overall Supply and Demand: In the space below please write in columns (1) and (4) the number of openings for specified years and in column (7) the number of anticipated openings for the 1999-2000 academic year. In columns (2) and (5) write the number of applicants (*AP*) you received for the openings. Finally, in columns (3) and (6) write the number of filled openings (*FS*). The program areas are (with minor modifications) from the list of programs reviewed by NCATE. If you do not have exact information, please provide a careful estimate.

Program/Area	(1) # Openings 1997-1998	(2) # *AP*	(3) # *FS*	(4) # Openings 1998-1999	(5) # *AP*	(6) # *FS*	(7) # Anticipated openings 1999-2000
Early Childhood	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Education Leadership/Admin	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Education Technology	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Education Foundation/Policy	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Elementary Education	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
English/Language Arts Education	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Health Education	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Mathematics Education	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Middle School Education	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Physical Education	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Reading Education	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
School Counseling	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
School Library Media	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
School Psychology	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Science Education	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Social Studies Education	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Special Education	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
TESOL/Bi-lingual Education	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Technology Education	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Other _____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Other _____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Other _____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____

reverse

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. Reasons for Shortages: This part of the survey asks you to indicate reasons that may have resulted in failed searches.

	4	3	2	1
A. To what *extent* has your institution experienced a decline in the number of applicants for positions vacant over the past 2 or 3 years? ***(Circle the response that most accurately reflects the situation in your SCDE.)***	Great	Some	Small	No

If you marked 2 or 1, skip to Section III.

B. Please circle the degree to which you "Agree" or "Disagree" with the following statements: ***(Circle the response that most accurately reflects the situation in your SCDE.)***

	4	3	2	1
a. Salaries in our SCDE are not competitive with other SCDEs.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
b. There are not enough individuals receiving doctorates in our vacancy area(s).	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
c. Our salaries will not allow us to recruit experienced teachers and administrators from the K-12 schools.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
d. The caliber of applicants did not meet our expectations.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
e. Other institutions (R & D organizations, professional organizations, government) are attracting candidates from the same pool.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
f. The economy is good and people are staying where they are.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

III. Demographic Data on Faculty Hires

A. Indicate the total number and percent of new faculty hires, by race/ethnicity for the academic years 1997-1998 and 1998-1999.

Race/Ethnic Origin	Total Number 1997-1998	Percentage of Total Faculty Hired	Total Number 1998-1999	Percentage of Total Faculty Hired
American Indian/Alaskan Native	_____	_____	_____	_____
Asian/Pacific American	_____	_____	_____	_____
Black, Not Hispanic Origin	_____	_____	_____	_____
Hispanic	_____	_____	_____	_____
White, Not Hispanic	_____	_____	_____	_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[1] NCATE Teacher Preparation: A guide to colleges and universities (1996) Washington, DC:NCATE

Copyright © 1999 by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.